



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to impose on the whole world not only their own political institutions but their own modes of thought. Year by year, almost, the number of independent Muslim States grows less and less, while such as still remain—Persia, Turkey, Arabia, Morocco, and a few others—are even more and more overshadowed by the menace of European interference. Of course it is in part their own fault, and Asiatic indifference and apathy combine with European “earth-hunger” and lust of conquest to hasten their disintegration. To the unreflecting Western mind the extinction of these States causes no regret, but only exhilarating thoughts of more “openings” for their children and their capital; but those few who know and love the East and its peoples, and realise how deeply we are indebted to it for most of the great spiritual ideas which give meaning and value to life, we feel, with Chesterton’s “Man in Green,” that with the subsidence of every such State something is lost to the world which can never be replaced.”

DIE ENTWICKLUNG DER ALTCHINESISCHEN ORNAMENTIK. Von *Werner von Hoerschelmann*. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Universalgeschichte Herausgegeben von *Karl Lamprecht*. Vol. IV. Leipsic, 1907. 48 pages and 32 plates. Price, 5.40 m.

It is gratifying to see that the subject of a doctor-thesis of Leipsic has been chosen from the field of Chinese archeology, and that interest in things of Chinese antiquity seems to be growing in Germany. The principal idea of the author is to establish a series of developments in ancient Chinese ornamentation from an original geometrical state gradually leading into a more and more realistic aspect. On the whole, he is correct in this thesis, and proves it by consulting ample material drawn from the Po-ku-t'u and K'ien-lung's Catalogue, the two best-known archeological productions of the Chinese. The limitation to Chinese drawings certainly has its disadvantages, as they are not always correct in regard to proportion, and in some cases do not even fully reproduce the whole of the decoration on the larger bronze vessels. This drawback is most obvious in the metal mirrors, in which the flat Chinese engraving entirely fails to bring out the relief-character of the design, and most of which are simply misdrawn. It is matter for regret that no legends are attached to the plates, and that no list of plates is given, and as an index is also lacking, it is possible only after considerable loss of time to hunt up what the author has to say about his illustrations. Nor is there, after all, a technical necessity for arranging pure line engravings on plates; they easily and naturally find their place in the text, where the reader can comfortably compare them with the description.

As the author is not familiar with Chinese, he consulted Prof. A. Conrady of the University of Leipsic, who most generously assisted him with his wide knowledge of Chinese literary and archeological subjects, and contributed many valuable notes to the paper. But without such assistance, he could have well availed himself of the bas-reliefs of the Han time, conveniently accessible through the work of Chavannes. Although we concur with the author in the general result of his industrious and interesting investigation, we are not always inclined to approve of his methods, or to agree with his opinions and evolutionary constructions of ornaments in every case. But it is impossible

to dwell on these points in the brief space of a review, as it would lead us too far away into general discussions of the whole question of ornamental development. Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie* is not a trustworthy or authoritative guide in this line, as the author seems to assume; and it is rather strange that the numerous researches of this subject carried on in America now for a decade, which have thoroughly revolutionized all former views, have hardly penetrated into the thoughts of Europe, except in a few ethnological circles. Such a fundamental question, for instance, as the dependence of an ornament upon the peculiar technique of the object to which it is applied,—a question much ventilated by Karl v. d. Steinen during recent years,—is not even touched upon in the present paper. The interpretation of the subject of the two prancing animals on the bronze figured on Plate XXII as being derived from a West-Asiatic or Babylonian model is not plausible. The characteristic feature of this representation is, as the author too justly emphasizes, the ornamental filling in of the two animals. This peculiar method, however, is, as S. Reinach (*"La représentation du galop dans l'art ancien et moderne,"* extrait de la *Revue Archéologique*, Paris, 1901, pp. 67, 68) has correctly demonstrated, characteristic of ancient Siberian art, and widely made use of in it. From there, I should venture to think, the Chinese motive also is derived. The man in front of the horned animal outlined on the same object is a very frequent theme on the reliefs of the pottery vases of the Han dynasty, and there is no reason to suspect the exercise of any foreign influence on such a simple and primitive affair. But whatever divergences of opinion there may be, Mr. v. Hoerschelmann has undeniably furnished a useful and meritorious contribution to the history of Chinese ornaments, the study of which it is hoped will be continued by him.

B. LAUFER.

DIE TIBETISCHE UEBERSETZUNG VON KALIDASAS MEGHADUTA. Nach dem roten und schwarzen Tanjur herausgegeben und ins Deutsche übertragen von Hermann Beckh. Aus dem Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften vom Jahre 1906. Berlin, 1907. 85 pages.

EIN BEITRAG ZUR TEXTKRITIK VON KALIDASAS MEGHADUTA. Von Hermann Beckh. Berlin, 1907. 37 pages.

With these two papers, Dr. H. Beckh introduces himself into the scientific world. The last-named he has recently presented as his thesis to the University of Berlin, and he has subjected the Tibetan translation of Kalidasa's Meghaduta to a most careful and minute study.

In the first treatise he gives a critical edition of the text in Tibetan characters based on a comparison of the three Tanjur copies of St. Petersburg, Berlin, and London, and accompanied by an elaborate array of critical notes. Then follows a literal translation after the Tibetan text, which is very instructive, as the author has added in parentheses many Tibetan-Sanskrit equations, and imparts full explanations of many poetical phrases and compositions, from which Tibetan lexicography will obtain a rich harvest. These results, the author promises to work up in a third paper.

In the second contribution he is engaged in the question as to what can be learned from the Tibetan version in regard to the Sanskrit text. Of primary